

By Mr. DENT:
H. Res. 622. Resolution for the investigation of effects of foreign trade on American economy; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:
H.R. 13113. A bill for the relief of Zofia Wodynska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):
H.R. 13114. A bill for the relief of Isabelle A. Samaha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13115. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jack R. Ellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:
H.R. 13116. A bill for the relief of Djura Zelenbaba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:
H.R. 13117. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos D. Koukounas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:
H.R. 13118. A bill for the relief of Juliana Poleac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:
H.R. 13119. A bill for the relief of Marlene E. Belfast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13120. A bill for the relief of Maria Cascarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:
H.R. 13121. A bill for the relief of Hans Hangartner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARMON:
H.R. 13122. A bill for the relief of William C. Wells; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 13123. A bill for the relief of Richard Heffner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 13124. A bill for the relief of Delbert J. Mauller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:
H.R. 13125. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Tummino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:
H.R. 13126. A bill for the relief of Bryant David Virmani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:
H.R. 13127. A bill for the relief of Santa Giamalva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:
H.R. 13128. A bill for the relief of Maria Falato Colacicco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:
H.R. 13129. A bill for the relief of Ali Khosrowkhan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:
H.R. 13130. A bill for the relief of Jung Ngon Woon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:
H.R. 13131. A bill for the relief of Narinder Singh Somal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

535. Mr. KOWALSKI presented a resolution of the Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, recommending continued identity and support of the Veterans' Employment Service, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We Want Medical Insurance, Not a "Giveaway"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the administration's long-shouted claims that the budget takes precedence over everything else, it is astonishing to find the President supporting a plan for direct subsidies that could cost the U.S. Treasury \$1.7 billion a year. Were the program to have other sponsorship, I am sure that the very spokesmen who advocate it would be calling it a giveaway.

As for the means test requirements of the administration plan, should we move backward in our social thinking to the days of the poorhouse and the county farm?

Instead of the subsidy and charity proposals of the administration, I believe the American people would much prefer the pay-as-you-go, self-supporting medical care proposed in Forand-type legislation.

None of us and particularly the senior citizens of the United States want any Federal handouts; we don't want any Federal charity. We want a workable insurance program that will give us protection against the costs of illness when we reach retirement age.

We have an efficient social security system already operating, which could easily handle the administration of a medical care program. There is no need for the establishment of a costly new agency.

The administration's handling of this whole question has been incomprehensible. First it told us there was no need for any medical care program for the elderly. As the election approached, the administration took another look at the mass of incontrovertible evidence and suddenly espoused the cause of medical care for the elderly. But, instead of an insurance program under which our citizens would pay during their working years for protection in their older years, the administration advanced its subsidy-charity program.

I urge that we bury forever the charity concept in social programs. Let us allow each American to preserve his dignity as a free citizen; let us reject the anachronistic thinking whereby the administration would have us deal with our own senior citizens in terms of treasury handouts and public charity.

Knights of Lithuania 47th Annual Convention at Worcester, Mass., August 21, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday evening the Knights of Lithuania concluded their 47th annual convention with a great banquet at the Hotel Bancroft in my home city of Worcester, Mass.

The Most Reverend Bernard J. Flanagan, D.D., bishop of Worcester diocese, addressed the gathering and the Rev-

erend John C. Jutt of St. Casimir's Church, Worcester, was the convention honorary chairman.

The feature of the evening was the ceremony during which the officials of this great patriotic organization conferred their Distinguished Award Medal upon our former colleague in the House and present junior Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DONN. The medal is annually given to the non-Lithuanian who has done most to advance the freedom of Lithuania. Senator DONN's inspiring acceptance award address appears elsewhere in today's Record.

It was my privilege to speak briefly to the assemblage and I have been requested to include in the Record my remarks, which follow:

Madam Chairlady, Your Excellency Bishop Flanagan, Reverend Fathers, Your Honor Mayor O'Brien, invited guests, officers and members of the Knights of Lithuania, it is a particular privilege and pleasure to meet again with some of my old friends here and join in welcoming you out-of-town members to our great city, the heart of the Commonwealth.

It is a significant tribute to the character and understanding of the Lithuanian people that the fundamental objectives of your great organization are prominent among the virtues most desperately needed by this Nation today to successfully defeat the Communist enemy and lead the world to a lasting peace under God.

Your first purpose is to instill in your members a deeper love of the Catholic faith. This you have consistently done and by your public expression of belief and trust in divine providence you provide an inspiring example to your fellow citizens as well as, I might say, a timely warning.

You realize that without a wider acceptance and practice of basic moral laws and principles by our people, this Nation is in grave danger of collapsing from internal weakness. You are devoting yourselves, in patriotic concern, to preventing such a dis-

graceful catastrophe and the country is particularly indebted to you for your effective work on this score alone.

Your further objectives are to encourage the appreciation of American citizenship and Lithuanian traditions and provide social activities. As one who was born, and has lived and worked among you all my life, no one has to tell me about the high manner in which you have carried out these objectives.

Your patriotic zeal in instructing and promoting the acceptance of the responsibilities of good citizenship among your members is well recognized and universally admired.

The Lithuanian traditions, the heritage of your forefathers, are those of love of God, loyalty to country, family faithfulness, preservation of individual freedom, and persevering courage in the face of adversity.

The wholesome qualities of your social activities, consisting of good fun, friendly association, personality development, and gracious hospitality, are a legend in this area as they are in world history.

All these fundamental Christian virtues constitute the reason why you have not, and never will, forsake the promotion of freedom for your home people who are bravely enduring cruel and inhuman persecution by atheistic Communist tyrants.

They are also, of course, the reason why the people of Lithuania themselves will never be completely subjugated and will fight relentlessly on to the blessed day, by God's grace, that they, and all the other Communist enslaved people, will be restored to freedom and independence.

You may be certain that so long as I live, as a private citizen or a public official, the heroic efforts of yourself and the people of your homeland to regain their rightful independence, will always be given my complete support.

Because you have set such an inspiring example of devotion and dedication to the freedom of Lithuania, you have enlisted the aid of practically all of the good people of the United States and, particularly, a great many of those in high public office.

One such great leader is here with you today, in the person of U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DONN. I have had the honor and privilege of serving with him, side by side, in the U.S. House of Representatives. I have heard him, time and time again, both in the House and Senate Chamber, advocate your cause with intense sincerity, with the intimate knowledge of his own experience at the Nuremberg trials at Germany, and the persuasive eloquence with which he is gifted.

There is no greater champion or more devoted advocate of freedom and independence for Lithuania, and all subjugated people, in this country, than Senator DONN.

I am pleased, indeed, to join with you in welcoming him to Worcester. The high honor you are bestowing upon him today is richly deserved and I know your selection will be universally applauded.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

SOCIAL SECURITY

Although I supported the Anderson amendment, I do intend to vote for the passage of this bill. I am particularly interested in the provision to permit men to voluntarily retire at age 62. This language was adopted by the Senate Committee on Finance, it having been proposed by an amendment offered by me and cosponsored by 21 other Senators.

Moreover, I believe that removal of the age 50 requirement is a necessity. If we act favorably on this bill, it will mean immediate benefits for a quarter of a million people, disabled workers and their dependents. The lifting of the age-50 requirement will mean a first-year saving in public assistance funds of approximately \$28 million. There is no basis for denying benefits to the group that is likely to be most in need of them—persons under age 50 who generally have family responsibilities. We all know that for a person to qualify for disability benefits he must be, according to the law, unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity. Sometimes he can be rehabilitated, and, despite his handicap, can earn a living for his family. More often he must look forward to a life without earnings of any kind. Many of our disabled are thereby forced to go on public assistance rolls.

I am also pleased with the provision paying benefits to survivors of workers who died before 1940. About 25,000 persons would benefit by this, most of them being aged widows of 75 and over.

What About Depressed Area Legislation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the recess which split the 2d session of the 86th Congress into two parts. I am convinced that, had politics been set aside in favor of serious legislative procedure, adjournment could have been achieved without difficulty in ample time before the beginning of the conventions in Los Angeles and Chicago. Perhaps, however, there is a saving grace to the strategy calling for a return to Washington in order that campaign speeches may echo out from the Halls of the Senate. If Congress—at long last—enacts reasonable distressed area legislation, then the split session can be considered worthwhile.

For all too long, the bills to relieve this chronic unemployment have been subjected to political tinkering of ridiculous proportions. Surplus labor regions could certainly have escaped at least 2 discouraging years of dismay and distress. Had not our distressed area bill been loaded down with omnibus amendments to destroy the basic intent of the legislation, we could today be enjoying industrial progress in many if not all of the com-

munities now listed in the surplus labor category. I have been over a large part of the 22d Congressional District in the past several weeks. In some communities and in some industries business is brisk and pay envelopes are plump. What is immediately apparent, however, are the valleys of inactivity and unemployment that mar what would otherwise be a very satisfactory relief map of economic conditions in our business district. You have the same conditions in regions of West Virginia, Kentucky, and in a number of other States.

To correct the situation would not require exceedingly heavy expenditures. I have proposed \$75 million for industrial loans and \$25 million for public facility loans. By foreign-aid standards, this disbursement would be extremely modest. Millions upon millions of dollars are provided annually by the International Cooperation Administration, whose source of income is the U.S. Treasury, to nations all over the globe for the purchase of materials—everything from soybeans and yarns to scientific instruments and industrial machinery. If you will but glance through a procurement information bulletin issued regularly by the ICA, you will be appalled at the number of listings of six- and seven-figure disbursements that permit the recipient nation to buy his promised trinkets and gadgets and automobiles and manufacturing plants wherever he wishes in the world market. Those are the items in which not a cent comes back to us, because the country enjoying our generosity is automatically relieved of any obligation to purchase the products of American industry and agriculture.

Then of course there is the Development Loan Fund which specializes in making available many millions of dollars so that nations other than the United States might enjoy the fruits of what the American taxpayer sends to Washington. The three brief announcements issued by the Development Loan Fund on June 3 recounted the approval of a \$9.7 million loan to Vietnam for railroad cars and equipment, a \$20 million loan to India for a thermopower plant, and a \$23 million loan to Yugoslavia for a plastics and chemical plant. To a resident of an area where pockets of unemployment abound, such reports are most disturbing, particularly in view of the fact that the United States insists on making dollars available to Communist Yugoslavia at a time when certain American industries vital to the national defense are suffering for want of action by the Government.

An additionally alarming statement was released by DLF on June 13 when it announced that loan applications totaling \$3,679 million had been received from 59 countries during the agency's first 26 months of operation. The report proceeds to list numerous categories in which loans have far exceeded the amount to be appropriated in the distressed area bills that I have before Congress.

The money to be used in carrying out the stated purpose of my latest bill would provide the means of getting American

workmen back on the payroll. These citizens would buy needed clothing and household materials and equipment from the processing and manufacturing plants of my State and yours. They would employ the services of electricians and plumbers and carpenters to provide long neglected repair work in their homes.

The money to be made available for a resurgence of industrial activity in specified communities and regions would generate business in other areas of the United States. It would not be sent abroad to be spent indiscriminately at the whim of foreign politicians.

While I have never subscribed to the theory that increased industrial and business activity is reflected in direct ratio to the amount of money allotted for public works and/or matching funds for stimulating employment, there is no question but that such appropriations will come back to us in many ways as compared with the donations that go to foreign nations. My proposal will not only make it possible for our people to return to work and once again assume the social and economic status that should be available to all of our citizenry; it will also once more enable them to begin contributing an important share of local, State, and Federal tax revenue. In addition, they will again be able to give to their churches and to charities, as has been their custom until economic inactivity set in.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you and to every Member of this legislative body to put into law as quickly as possible the distressed area legislation which I have proposed.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Radio Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the East-West struggle—despite best efforts of the West to resolve the differences, and establish a solid foundation for peace—promises to be a long, arduous, trying contest between two ideologies, freedom and communism.

By experience, we have learned that the Soviets use every possible tactic: ethical and unethical, legal or illegal, right or wrong, to forward their cause.

Recognizing the great stakes in the struggle, I believe we need to explore every known avenue—and search for new ones—not only to counter the Soviet offensive, but to establish conditions under which ultimately peace, order, and law can be a normal process of life in the world, and such things as the Iron and Bamboo Curtains can be rolled back, to give the people in bondage a voice in self-determination.

As one way of "getting through" to the people behind the Iron Curtain, I was recently privileged to broadcast to the Soviet Union over Radio Liberty.

Personally, I feel that getting the facts to the peoples themselves, to provide them with the truth, and to offset the propaganda of the Kremlin-controlled press and other information media, will serve us well in the long struggle ahead against this infamous ideology.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the broadcast reviewing factors of the U-2 flight and the RB-47 case printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, SENIOR REPUBLICAN OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, TO THE PEOPLE OF THE SOVIET UNION OVER RADIO LIBERTY

NEEDED: MORE EMPHASIS ON MUTUAL INTERESTS THAN DIFFERENCES

As citizens of great world powers, we have a great many mutual interests, together with mankind, around the globe. Fundamentally, I believe, we all want to attempt to create a better world in which to live.

Instead of quarreling about our differences, we would do better to expand areas of agreement and, as possible, to cooperate in support of programs that would achieve a better, safer life for all of us.

We would welcome the opportunity to channel the vast efforts, manpower, and resources going into armaments, in the United States and, yes, in the Soviet Union, as well as other nations, for things which would improve, not threaten to destroy, life on the globe. These resources could be used to produce more and better homes, schools, food, clothing, and other things that contribute to a good life.

NEEDED: GREATER EXCHANGES OF TRUTH

In a world weary of tensions, but full of promise for a better life, I believe there is a need for greater exchanges of truth between the people of our two great countries.

How can this be done? Through radio, television, newspapers and magazines opening the doors—that is, lifting the Iron Curtain for better neighbor-to-neighbor relations.

What would more exchange of ideas accomplish? Among other things, it would eliminate the fears, often born of untruths, that we as a nation want war; or that you, the people of the Soviet Union, want war; and also reaffirm our common dedication to peace; to a desire to channel our resources and the wonderful human ingenuity of our two great peoples to building a better life.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND SOVIET SYSTEM

Now, let's be realistic: There are differences in East-West ideology, between the political systems under which we live. From long experience, we have learned that these differences will not easily be eliminated.

However, the differing ideological beliefs should not obscure the reality that you and ourselves—in common with all other people of earth—want, wish for, and are willing to sacrifice to attain—peace.

Ultimately, we can hope for the great ground swell of free public opinion from the common people of the world to provide the strength and wisdom to direct the affairs of men and governments in all nations toward the goal of peace.

In the cycle of international events, regrettably, there continue to be problems—sometimes, we feel, deliberately created—to stir up tensions, distort the truth, create misunderstandings and alienate our people from each other. In such circumstances, we recognize, of course, that there are always two points of view.

Now, I'd like to review with you some of the current problems and our ideas on them so that you, the people of the Soviet Union, may better know how we feel about them.

To prevent the possibility of sneak attacks against any nation and thus eliminate one of the great fears in the hearts of the people of the world, for example, our Nation, in the past, has proposed open skies and mutual inspection of armament installations.

Despite President Eisenhower's effort to get open skies, Mr. Khrushchev, unfortunately, has not been willing to make such an arrangement.

As a people dedicated to peace, we have asked the question: Why? If the Kremlin, as it claims, is dedicated to peace, then why would it not open its doors as we would do to inspect armament installations, to prevent surprise attacks by any nation?

Had Mr. Khrushchev been willing to agree to an open skies proposal as recommended by President Eisenhower, or to work in a really constructive way to establish peace, the U-2 flight, for example, would not, I believe, have occurred at all.

In considering this flight, it's important to take into account the following factors:

1. The plane was not armed, instead it carried only cameras.

2. The U-2 flights occurring for 4 years have at no time committed any act of aggression against the people of the Soviet Union.

3. The information obtained from such flights has never been used for any aggressive acts against the Soviet Union, and

4. As yet, there have been no international agreements as to how high a nation's rights extend into air space. Consequently, there is serious question as to whether or not there was any real violation of international law with the plane flying at 60,000 or 70,000 feet. As you recall, for example, the Soviet Union launched the first satellite, Sputnik I. However, nobody attempted to shoot it down. If the U-2 violated air space, then perhaps the sputnik also violated the same interests of other nations.

RB-47 FLIGHT DID NOT VIOLATE SOVIET AIRSPACE

Now, let's look at another case. You will recall that recently, the Soviet armed forces shot down a U.S. plane over international waters. Then, charges were made against the United States in the U.N. that the RB-47 violated Soviet air space. Following the charges, the Security Council considered the case.

In effect, the U.N. threw the case out of court. Why? The charges were not based upon truth. To the contrary, it appears there has been a violation of international law by Mr. Khrushchev. How is this? Because the U.S. plane was flying over international waters at the time it was shot down. According to the evidence presented at the U.N., and substantiated on a scientific basis by other nations, the U.S. plane at no time flew closer than 30 miles to your country.

Consequently, the RB-47 incident has put the Soviet Government in a strangely unfavorable light. Why? First of all, it was a violation of international law; a needless killing of men; and an act that could result in grave consequences for world peace.

Secondly, the Soviet Government has been carrying on information-collecting activities near the United States. For example, a Soviet ship, equipped with radio-radar and

other devices for information collecting, anchored 13 miles off our coast. If the United States employed Mr. Khrushchev's tactics, we would have sunk the ship, and killed or imprisoned the persons aboard.

Did we do this? No. Instead, we merely took pictures, photographing the vessel, to prove that it was on an information-gathering mission.

At the U.N., the United States also proposed an impartial investigation of the facts of the RB-47 flight. Unfortunately, the Soviet Government refused to submit to such an investigation.

Why? From experience, we have learned that anyone, if he is right, is not likely to turn down an impartial investigation; in all likelihood, this would only provide greater evidence for his case.

Basically, we believe that the shooting down of the RB-47 flight was a violation of law, and of good conduct by nations. The actions of the Soviet Government, also, have resulted in the needless death of several persons aboard the RB-47, as well as illegally retaining custody of two of the fliers, Lt. John R. McKone and Lt. Freeman B. Olmstead in violation of international law.

With a long history of fairness and greatness, however, I feel that you, the people of the Soviet Union, would like to know both sides of the story including what we feel is the truth.

Submerged Lands Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, this week I introduced a bill—H.R. 12964—designed to correct a serious inequity which has developed regarding the claims of the several States on the Gulf of Mexico to tidelands oil, minerals, and other offshore resources.

This bill would amend section 4 of the Submerged Lands Act—43 U.S.C. 1312—to approve and confirm the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending three marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico.

Legislation such as this is required because of a recent Supreme Court ruling which I believe to be unfair and wholly unconscionable.

In its decisions in the cases of the United States versus the States of Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, delivered May 31, 1960, the Court in divided opinions decided that the respective boundaries of Florida and Texas extend 3 marine leagues—or 10½ miles—seaward; while the boundaries of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana extend only 3 miles to sea.

The result of this peculiar ruling, of course, is that two Gulf States are given special privileges in laying claim to offshore mineral wealth while three other States on the same gulf are relegated to lesser positions; and are, in fact, precluded from reaping the natural benefits of their geography.

Certainly it was not the intent of Congress in enacting the Submerged Lands Act of 1953 to rob, shortchange, or otherwise mistreat any of the Gulf States in relation to treatment given any other Gulf States.

In his opinion of the May 31 decision, partly concurring and partly dissenting, Mr. Justice Black said of the Submerged Lands Act—

Nothing in the act itself indicates that Texas was to be given any more consideration in this case than Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama. Had Congress wanted to give the land to Texas and refuse to give it to the other States it easily could have done so. As Congress indicated, it is time that the problem be solved, the title be quieted, and the controversy be stilled. In my judgment to interpret this act in a way which grants the land to Texas and Florida and withholds it from the other Gulf States simply prolongs this costly and disquieting controversy. It will not be finally settled until it is settled the way Congress believes is right, and I do not think Congress will believe it right to award these marginal lands to Texas and Florida and deny them to the other Gulf States.

Those Members of Congress who were embroiled in the ramifications of this legislation in 1953 will recall that it was the expressed desire of Congress that the Submerged Lands Act would settle, one time for all time, the injustices, uncertainties, and delays which have for years plagued every sincere attempt to develop the sorely needed offshore resources.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs stated in both reports to the 80th and 83d Congresses:

We are certain that until the Congress enacts a law consonant with what the States and the Supreme Court believed for more than a century was the law, confusion and uncertainty will continue to exist, titles will remain clouded, and years of vexations and complicated litigation will result.

Sponsors of the Submerged Lands Act in 1953 thought Congress had accomplished an equitable solution in that act, but apparently this act did not go far enough. The Supreme Court now interprets the actions of Congress that year as having desired favored treatment for one State over another.

I maintain Congress did not intend favored treatment for any one State. If the Supreme Court can read this intention into the Submerged Lands Act, let us pass additional legislation, spelling out in no uncertain terms that fair and equal treatment is to be meted to all the Gulf States in the access to offshore submerged lands.

This is what my bill, H.R. 12964, seeks to provide.

It gives to Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana the same seaward boundaries as the Supreme Court has awarded to Florida and Texas.

As Mr. Justice Douglas says in his dissenting opinion of the May 31 decision:

If the policy of measuring the zone of the United States as "three leagues" into the gulf off the shore of Texas is to give Texas property rights to the submerged lands in that zone, the beneficiaries of that concern should be all our Gulf States. * * * All

the States on the gulf should be given the same benefit of the doubts that have been resolved in favor of Texas.

I certainly realize, Mr. Speaker, that there are many matters which could and perhaps ought to be resolved at this abbreviated session of Congress, and there is precious little time in which to act.

But there is no matter of greater concern nor of more importance, it seems to me, than that of clearing the air for putting to work the mineral wealth which lies off the coasts of our Gulf States.

This matter of submerged lands has drifted aimlessly for so long and now is further complicated by such an unjustifiable Court decision that it behooves us to act upon it responsibly at the earliest possible time.

The Congressman From Hawaii: The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, a distinguished war hero and a Territorial Senator named DAN K. INOUE was overwhelmingly elected by the greatest number of votes recorded by any candidate in the history of Hawaiian politics to represent the new and sovereign State of Hawaii in the Congress of the United States. A brand-new State and a freshman Congressman—a combination that portended a hard challenge ahead.

The heavy mantle of responsibility for the young State of Hawaii was thrown upon the young shoulders of DAN K. INOUE. The congressional records bear immutable evidence that the young State and the young Congressman met the challenge well. The same qualities which Hawaii saw in DAN won him the love and respect of seasoned legislative veterans and leaders of the Washington scene.

His parental ancestry, in combination with this thoroughly American-as-apple personality, provided a cold war weapon which Congress and our Nation were quick to recognize and utilize. During the past year DAN has been sent to the Pacific Trust Territories, Okinawa, Korea, Japan, Formosa, the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong and the Philippines, functioning as a veritable one-man East-West center. A few months ago the young legislator was appointed as an American delegate to the conference of the Interparliamentary Union in Tokyo, Japan. DAN is the first freshman Member of Congress to represent the United States in the entire 80-year history of this the oldest international legislative organization. DAN was recently appointed cochairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the President's

people-to-people program in charge of East-Asian activities. The Nation has recognized DAN's outstanding legislative and diplomatic talents.

As an experienced legislator, whose courage and love for his country are beyond question, Hawaii's first U.S. Congressman has written an eloquent paragraph for peace in today's stormy chapter of international affairs. DAN has brought great credit and prestige for the people of Hawaii.

The brilliance of DAN's international and national accomplishments is matched by his assiduous and devoted attention to the immediate, practical needs of the people who elected him. In a short period of 12 months DAN has astounded Washington observers by his legislative know-how in guiding and assisting in the passage of the following measures:

Establishment of the East-West Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange in Hawaii—H.R. 7500.

Assistance for the economic development of the Ryukyu Islands—H.R. 1157. Construction of an enlarged turning basin in Kahului Harbor, \$944,500—H.R. 7634.

Lifting of ceilings on loans administered by the Federal National Mortgage Association for the State of Hawaii—H.R. 10213.

Authorization to use Federal highway funds for the construction of approach roads to ferry terminal facilities and also for the construction of ferry terminal facilities—H.R. 10495.

Granting of the sum of \$6 million to the college of agriculture at the University of Hawaii—H.R. 11602.

Granting of certain tariff and tax exemptions for Hawaii west coast shipping lines—H.R. 11748.

Provision for the permanent airlift of Hawaii's first-class mail—H.R. 12595.

Inclusion of Hawaii in the Interstate Defense Highway System, \$12.5 million—H.R. 11602.

Provision for the presentation of the first U.S. flag with 50 stars to be flown over the U.S. Capitol to the honored dead now resting in Punchbowl National Cemetery—House Joint Resolution 546.

Appropriations of \$10 million for the first year and \$20 million for the following 2 years for the East-West Cultural Center—H.R. 11666.

Appropriations for feasibility studies by the Army Corps of Engineers—\$10,000 for Honolulu Harbor project; \$50,000 for Barbers Point Harbor project; \$6,000 for Waikiki Beach erosion project; and \$5,000 for the Kawainui Swamp project—H.R. 7634.

Authorization for the Army Corps of Engineers to make preliminary surveys and studies of the following projects—H.R. 7634: Kahoma Stream flood control, Maui; Kahaluu Harbor project, Oahu; Maalaea Bay deep sea harbor, Maui; lava flow barrier, Hawaii.

Authorization of a new Federal building in Honolulu, \$23.5 million; authorization for a public health clinic and quarantine station in Honolulu—\$1,887,000.

Increases in Federal grants to the State of Hawaii—over \$400,000.

Authorization to conduct a feasibility study on the construction of a Hilo Harbor seawall or protective barrier—H.R. 7634.

Pay raises for Federal Government employees—H.R. 9883.

Hawaii has left an indelible mark of distinction in its first year of statehood. It has shared in the rewards of first-class citizenship. It has contributed its material and human assets to our Nation. And one of its proudest contributions has been Hawaii's first U.S. Congressman, the Honorable DAN K. INOUE.

Why Not Use Our Farm Surplus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has long been a champion and strong exponent of developing an effective research program so as to increase industrial utilization of our agricultural abundance.

The Senator from South Dakota, who serves so ably on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has long held the conviction that the development of new markets for our farm products both at home and abroad can provide one of the solutions to the difficulties which now confront American agriculture.

That the Senator is recognized as one of the eminent authorities in this field is without question, for we all have followed with interest the dedicated efforts he has made and continues to make for the American farmer.

This week on the newstands of America, the distinguished Senator once again makes a strong case for this program to utilize farm products. An article written by Senator KARL MUNDT is appearing in the September issue of *Mechanix Illustrated*, entitled "A Senator Says—Let's Abolish Our \$1,000-a-Minute Farm Surplus."

Not only does Karl Mundt's article make good reading, it makes good sense, and I deem it a privilege to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENATOR SAYS LET'S ABOLISH OUR \$1,000-A-MINUTE FARM SURPLUS

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT)

In the past 26 years the American taxpayer has paid more than \$40 billion for farm programs. This year alone the American taxpayer will pay more than \$4 billion for farm supports; more than \$1,500,000 a day—more than \$1,000 a minute—to store farm commodities in surplus.

The American taxpayer pays \$6,000 a day to store peanuts; \$131 a day to store honey; \$238 a day to store tobacco. Flaxseed and rye cost \$7,000 a day in storage fees; oats, \$15,000 a day. Rice costs \$17,000; soybeans, \$23,000 a day; milk and butter fats, \$29,000; barley, \$65,000 a day; and cotton, \$76,000.

When the taxpayer reaches into his pocket to pay storage costs on more vital items in surplus, he pays \$262,000 a day to store grain sorghums; \$444,000 a day to store corn; \$579,000 a day to pay wheat storage costs.

And these reported warehousing costs do not include miscellaneous charges such as acquisition costs, financing, supervision, and the salaries of needed administrative employees in the Department of Agriculture.

This entire support program, growing yearly in size, can collapse of its own weight at any time. As more than one of my colleagues in the Senate has asked—When are we going to get the American taxpayer out of the farm business?

American taxpayers have paid for farm programs that called for plowing under corn, killing pigs, subsidizing exports. During one 4-year period of the farm support program, the U.S. Government—meaning the American taxpayer—owned a total of 235 million pounds of surplus cheese and more than 1 billion pounds of surplus tobacco.

Yet the U.S. Government can solve the expanding farm surplus problem and relieve the American taxpayer. It can do for the agricultural industry the same type of job the so-called Manhattan project accomplished in the atomic field. With a stepped-up program of farm-product and farm-marketing research on a crash basis, we could channel our increasing farm output into an expanding market right here at home.

We are living in an industrial age. American people are using more products, more materials, more equipment of all kinds than ever before, and that use is increasing daily. Many of the products, equipment, and materials can be supplied from raw materials grown on American farms.

For instance, we can, as many European countries do, use alcohol extracted from grain as a blend with gasoline for our automobiles and farm tractors.

We are the greatest consumers of motor fuel in the world. If we blend only 5 percent of grain alcohol with gasoline, we will conserve precious supplies of petroleum that are now being exhausted. The Indianapolis Speedway drivers use alcohol in their fuel because it gives more propulsion, more speed, more efficiency. Expanding this one use alone would get the American taxpayer out of the farm business.

We could, as we did during World War II, make our synthetic rubber supplies of grain alcohol. The Department of Commerce predicts a doubling of synthetic rubber requirements by 1975. If we were to reopen the eight Government synthetic rubber plants closed after World War II, they would consume approximately 100 million bushels of grain annually.

This would mean we could use corn and wheat now in storage (that must be reaching a stage unfit for human consumption) in a productive fashion rather than adding to the tax burden.

We can divide a bushel of wheat, use the starch for alcohol and develop new markets for the protein that is the residue. We can make a K-ration, rich in vitamins and minerals, and pack it in a wheat carton to supplement our school lunch program and help the needy here at home who are on relief status.

The American petroleum industry now spends over \$3 billion a year in research. The result is obvious in the flood of new

products from petroleum. This compares with the figure of about one-twentieth of 1 percent of the gross sales of our agricultural output devoted to the search for new uses for agricultural products.

But we have found that everything made today from petrochemicals can also be made from grain; the molecules are interchangeable. Grain alcohol can be used to make not only motor fuel and synthetic rubber but new, more pliable plastics; solvents; surface coatings to repair the 700,000 miles of roads that need repairing. It can be used for explosives, insecticides, lubricants. It can serve our missiles, turbojets, and rockets.

We can relieve the newsprint shortage by making newsprint from wheat straw. We can make paper from surplus wheat and corn. If we simply add grain starch to wood pulp in paper production, this one use alone would consume 100 million added bushels of corn yearly.

We could absorb the vast farm surplus; we could add new products from what we now consider waste. A few years ago, driving through South Dakota, one would see the horizon dotted by colorful piles of burning straw. Now we know this straw we once burned can be used to make much needed newsprint and strawboard.

We can use wheat and corn starches as coating agents for textiles. We already produce a corn fiber called vicara for the manufacture of clothes. With intensification of our agricultural research, we would see buildings constructed of corn cob concrete. We will wear clothes made of a luxurious corn fiber similar to cashmere. We may soon wear rainproof coats made from corn. Some are already made from lard.

We must recognize that one of the strongest contributing factors to the food surplus problem exists in the very nature of farming. Our 6 million farmers have had little opportunity, due to the independent nature of farming, to apply the modern techniques of merchandising and research that have been the dynamic forces for growth in American industrial life.

If we but use the brains of some of our jet-age scientists in an agricultural Manhattan project that includes both creative and marketing research, we can bring to American homes a flood of new products that will stagger the imagination.

To spark this grain-chemical revolution, to organize this agricultural Manhattan project, we need to establish a separate agency of Government with funds and authority to apply modern techniques of research, marketing, and merchandising.

This new agency would have the authority to let contracts to industrial organizations with laboratories; it would have the authority to put scientists to work.

It would have the authority to seek out new ways to utilize the knowledge found in these laboratories; authority to develop markets, to help finance early production of new products from farm commodities. It would apply modern techniques to create a real consumer demand for these products. It would offer scholarships to young people to study farm-product science.

Some have suggested that the problem can be solved merely by shipping all our surplus food overseas to the needy peoples of other lands. We have shipped food overseas to many areas but to attempt to solve our gigantic surplus problem in this manner is to assume additional costs and burdens of transportation with little assurance the food will reach deserving peoples. We can ship the food to ports of underdeveloped nations but distribution facilities to the remote villages of the world are poor or lacking entirely.

And we must also remember that to try to solve our surplus food problem by foreign giveaways is to antagonize friendly allies who have surpluses of their own.

We must recognize that to find a realistic solution to these surpluses, and ultimate relief for the taxpayer, we must create additional farm-product markets at home. These markets can only be created by the research program suggested here and by industrial application of our farm products.

Established on a crash basis, this new project would not only move the giant surpluses out of the warehouses onto the American markets, it would create new jobs. It would spur merchandising, advertising, transportation—all retail progress. It would spark a new, higher standard of living throughout the entire American economy. It would mean a fair price for a full crop for farmers.

And it would end, once and for all, the crushing burden on the American taxpayer: \$1,000-a-minute for the storage of farm surplus that should and must be put to productive use for the benefit of all.

Senator Thomas J. Dodd Receives Distinguished Award Medal From Knights of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday evening, August 21, 1960, it was my privilege and pleasure to attend the dinner, in my home city of Worcester, Mass., marking the closing session of the 47th Annual Convention of the Knights of Lithuania.

The outstanding feature of this dinner was the official conferring of this great organization's Distinguished Award Medal upon our former House colleague and present junior Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD. The medal is annually given to the non-Lithuanian who has done most to advance the freedom of Lithuania.

The Most Reverend Bernard J. Flanagan, D.D., present bishop of Worcester, and former head of the diocese of Norwich, Conn., Senator Dodd's birthplace, characterized the Senator as "a friend of freedom, a man who has spoken eloquently for captive peoples—and a man who has not let us forget our obligations toward them."

The Reverend John C. Jutt of St. Casimirs Church, convention honorary chairman, in his remarks, also praised Senator Dodd for "his tireless efforts and dedication, which have given Lithuanians courage never to give up in the fight for freedom."

It was indeed another memorable event in the long, patriotic history of the Knights of Lithuania and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include, at this point, the inspiring ac-

ceptance award address delivered by Senator Dodd. His speech follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD BEFORE KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA CONVENTION IN WORCESTER, AUGUST 21, 1960

Bishop Flanagan, Mayor O'Brien, Father Jutt, distinguished guests, friends, I am moved and deeply honored by the award you have bestowed upon me. But when I ask myself, What have I done to deserve this award? I am, very frankly, troubled.

Somehow it seems to me that it would be more appropriate if I, as an American were here to present an award to a representative of the Lithuanian people. For no people in the world has fought more heroically for freedom, or suffered more cruelly under tyranny, or clung more tenaciously to their national identity, their cultural and spiritual heritage, their faith in the ultimate triumph of freedom.

This great nation, this nation of heroes and martyrs, has, in its suffering, become a symbol for free men everywhere.

On the one hand, the agony of your people serves as a constant reminder to us of the ignorance and cynicism and lack of foresight and courage that resulted in the abandonment of the captive peoples of Europe at the close of World War II.

On the other hand, by their obstinate refusal to reconcile themselves to tyranny, either under the Czars or under the Bolsheviks, the Lithuanian people have inspired all of us to fight harder and work harder for the eternal cause of freedom.

If I have sometimes spoken up on behalf of the Lithuanian people and the other captive peoples of Europe, if I have sometimes urged that we seek after more effective ways of promoting their liberation, I take no special credit for this. To me it has been a simple matter of conscience. I would have been delinquent had I done less. And so it seems to me that, instead of receiving an award from you, it is I who should be presenting an award—an award for exemplary courage and spiritual fortitude—either to some living Lithuanian patriot or to the unknown soldier of the Lithuanian resistance movement.

America has every reason to be proud of its citizens of Lithuanian extraction—and you have every reason to be proud of your ancestry.

The history of the Lithuanian people, as I have read it, is an epic story of heroism and suffering and man's unquenchable will to assert his God-given human rights. It is a story to be told again and again, for free men everywhere have much to learn from it.

I believe the story of Lithuania should be told for another reason. Better than any story I know, it illustrates the nature of the enemy we now confront. It teaches us how much trust can be placed in treaties with the Kremlin, in its pledges of coexistence, in its off-and-on pretenses of friendship. It teaches us how inhuman international bolshevism is, how utterly without morality or restraint.

When the Lithuanian people, at the close of World War I established their own Government and proclaimed their independence, the Bolsheviks invaded the newly established state. There were many bitter battles but finally the Lithuanian people emerged triumphant. On July 19, 1920, the Soviet Government signed a treaty of peace. It declared in this treaty—mark these words well—that it "voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory."

For 20 years Lithuania knew peace and independence. During this period, there was a great renaissance of their national literature and culture.

But then came the Hitler-Stalin pact and the partition of Poland between Germany and the Soviet Union. Almost immediately the Kremlin demanded permission to place 20,000 troops in Lithuania for the duration of the war. These troops, it was emphasized, would be removed at the end of the war. Prime Minister Stalin himself stated—and again mark these words well—"We respect the independence of the Lithuanian State. We are disposed to defend its territorial integrity."

History records no blacker or more perfidious lie by the head of a great state.

On October 10, 1939, only 2 weeks after the original demand was served on Lithuania, the Soviet Union concentrated its armed forces on the Lithuanian frontier. The Government of this brave little nation had no alternative but to sign the pact of mutual assistance which the Kremlin placed before it. But at the point of signing, they discovered that the clause stipulating that Soviet bases would be maintained in Lithuania only for the duration of the war had been stricken from the agreement, on the personal instruction of Stalin.

This was only the beginning of the perfidy. Eight months later, on June 14, 1940, the Soviet Government demanded that the Lithuanian Minister of the Interior and Director of Security be brought to trial, that a government friendly to the Soviet Union be installed and that the Red army be granted free entry in force into the territory of Lithuania. There was not even time to reply to this ultimatum. The very next day, on June 15, the Red army occupied Lithuania and the Government was compelled to flee abroad.

The Communists had made their plans carefully, as they always do, and they moved rapidly. They had a quisling regime ready to install. They had their lists of names of Lithuanian patriots who were slated for arrest and execution. They had their plan of action.

On July 7, 3 weeks after the occupation, the quisling regime ordered the liquidation of all non-Communist parties and the arrest of their leaders. On July 14 and 15, the people were compelled to vote in national elections with only the Communist Party represented. The Lithuanian people resisted heroically, desperately. But they were fighting against hopeless odds. On July 17, the regime announced that 95.1 percent of the people had voted and that 99.19 percent of these had cast their ballot for the Communist Party.

Two days later, on July 21, the so-called People's Diet convened for its first session. In less than 1 hour, without any debate, it voted unanimously to ask the supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. to admit Lithuania into the Soviet state as one of its federated Soviet Socialist Republics.

What an object lesson this should be to all those who insist that we must be trustful, who wish to believe that the world's difficulties can be resolved by signing another treaty of nonaggression and coexistence with the Kremlin, who think that we can somehow improve relations by signing treaties on Antarctica or on outer space or on Berlin.

I know there are those who will say, "But the events you relate took place in Stalin's day. Today we have a new regime, a regime that is less brutal, less immoral." How they can argue this in the face of everything that has happened in the captive nations, in the face of the brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolution, in the face of Khrushchev's ultimatums and threats of nuclear war—how they can still pretend that there has been some basic change for the good in Soviet policy, I cannot understand.

Let me point to one simple fact. The man directly responsible for the occupation of Lithuania under Stalin was Gen. Ivan Serov.

It was he who installed the quisling government, who directed the mass arrests of Lithuanian patriots, who was responsible for the brutal deportations of scores and hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians to the oblivion of the Soviet slave labor camps.

It was the same Gen. Ivan Serov who was responsible for the inhuman suppression of the Hungarian revolution, the perfidious arrest of General Maletier while he was negotiating under flag of truce, the mass deportations of Hungarians which took place after the Soviet occupation.

In short, the only thing that has changed in the Soviet slave empire is that Khrushchev has succeeded Stalin. There is the same total inhumanity, the same total perfidy, even the same General Serov. Let me correct myself. There has been another small change. General Serov has been promoted. He is now the head of the Soviet secret police.

The despots of the Kremlin may be efficient, but, like all tyrants, they have a blind spot. They believe that, with enough oppression, they can ultimately destroy the human will to freedom. How wrong they are. The Hungarian revolution and the continuing resistance of the Lithuanian people and of the other peoples of the captive nations prove once again that neither 1 generation nor 2 generations nor 10 generations of brainwashing can produce a breed of men that is willing to accept the denial of the God-given human rights as natural and proper.

The word "liberation" has been somewhat compromised because in the 1952 campaign it was used as a crude election slogan. It is however a good word, a word for which there is no substitute. Instead of abandoning the word, as some have proposed, we must redeem it and give it meaning.

To use it again as an electioneering slogan or simply to pay lip service to it would—I agree completely—be the height of irresponsibility. If we use the word again—and I wholeheartedly urge that we do—we must do so as a serious act of self-dedication, and we must spell out precisely what we mean. "Liberation" does not mean that we confront the Soviets with an ultimatum and launch a war if they object to it. Basically, liberation will have to come from within. But what we say and what we do can encourage or discourage the spirit of liberation—while our behavior at critical moments like the Hungarian revolution can be of decisive importance.

How should we go about encouraging the liberation movement? The first step, in my opinion, would be to demonstrate the earnestness of our concern by raising the issue of the captive nations at every diplomatic conference and at every U.N. session.

In enslaving the captive nations, the Soviets were guilty of violating a whole series of international agreements that guaranteed free election. In imposing their regimes and maintaining them in power, they have used the Soviet Army in the most flagrant manner as an instrument of political intimidations; and when intimidations failed in Germany and in Hungary in recent years, they resorted to open military intervention and repression. They have violated the U.N. Charter repeatedly and at almost every point.

Let us spread the facts about Soviet imperialism on the record at every available opportunity. Let us continue to demand that the Soviets respect all their obligations.

Above all let us make liberation a cardinal goal of our diplomacy. I do not underestimate the difficulty of persuading the Kremlin to liberate its satellite empire. But, after Hungary, I find it easy to conceive of a situation where a combination of division within the Kremlin, unrest in the satellites and hard bargaining on the part of the West will

induce the Soviets—in their own interest—to grant freedom to the unyielding, troublesome captive peoples of Europe.

Liberation is not a pipedream. It is the only conceivable way in which we can recapture the political offensive. And, as every schoolboy knows, a side which defends itself when attacked but never takes the offensive, is bound to lose. The same is true in politics.

A point in history has been reached where men who are free must come to the aid of those who seek to be free, because if they do not, the chances are that they will lose their own freedom.

Mr. Chairman, in accepting this award, I salute the brave people of Lithuania. I promise you that I shall continue to speak about the captive nations and the issue of liberation at every appropriate opportunity.

And I venture to prophesy that, before I am too old to travel, I will some day have the great pleasure of visiting a free Lithuania—of visiting your ancient capital of Vilnius, which I have so often wanted to see, and of drinking a toast to freedom and to enduring friendship between the Lithuanian and American nations there, with some of my friends in this audience.

Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks concerning H.R. 10, the Keogh bill:

SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS RETIREMENT ACT

Most of us in Congress agree that the problems of our present aged population deserve our most urgent consideration. No less pressing, however, is the problem of our aged of the future. The question of how the needs of this growing segment of our population will be met may soon assume critical proportions if we continue to neglect seeking the answers.

One answer to this many-faceted question is found, I believe, in H.R. 10, the Keogh bill, which would help millions of our self-employed people provide for their retirement years. These people—workers in agriculture, forestry, fishing, small businesses and the professions—would be allowed to deduct from their Federal income tax up to 10 percent of their annual net earnings, or \$2,500 (whichever is less), in order to put this money into their own retirement program as specified in the bill. Under this legislation, the self-employed would finally have the tax advantage on their retirement savings similar to that which employees covered by employer-financed pension plans have had for some time.

The spirit of individuality which the self-employed exemplify is basic to our national heritage and to our economy. To fail to encourage it through removing legislative inequities is economic and social folly.

Our men and women must be given the opportunity to use their years of productivity to prepare for less prosperous days. For the self-employed, H.R. 10 is a just means to this important end.